



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,212	11/04/2005	Georg Weber	588.1041	5166
23280	7590	08/09/2007	EXAMINER	
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC			LOPEZ, FRANK D	
485 SEVENTH AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10018			3745	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/09/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/520,212	WEBER ET AL.
	Examiner F. Daniel Lopez	Art Unit 3745
<i>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>		
THE REPLY FILED 23 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.		
<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<p>NOTICE OF APPEAL</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>23 July 2007</u>. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>		
<p>AMENDMENTS</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>		
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.</p>		
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>		
<p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>		
<p>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>		
<p>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p>		
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</p>		
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>		
<p>/F. Daniel Lopez/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3745</p>		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant states "it is clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that Morita et al is speaking of conventional teeth and not specifically saw teeth". Furthermore, Morita et al asks for increasing a height (depth) of a thread, to increase joint strength, which teaches away from saw teeth as changing the shape of teeth does not strengthen the housing. And therefore, it is not obvious to combine saw teeth with Morita et al.

Applicant appears to be reading a number of things into Morita et al. Morita et al does not say anything about the shape of the threaded teeth, not even Applicant's "conventional teeth" (since even the teeth are drawn generically), and therefore does not teach for or against any shape. Applicant is clearly reading conventional teeth and only conventional teeth, into the silence of Morita et al. From this applicant reads into the statement of teeth height, that the shape of the teeth can not change. The examiner shares neither of these interpretations. The teaching of Morita et al, that increasing the height of the teeth increases the joint strength, is true of a number of different shapes, including saw teeth. Therefore, Morita et al does not teach away from using saw teeth.

Applicant appears to state that there was a long felt problem of increased joint strength in compressors. If there was a long felt need for increased joint strength in compressors, then it would not be obvious to add saw teeth to the compressors of Olson and Morita et al. But this long felt need is not supported in any way. If applicant submits real evidence of a long felt need, then this rejection would be reviewed in light of this evidence.

Morita et al does not support the view that there is a long felt need. Morita et al is actually saying that a solution of joint strength is well known, to increase either of thread height or number of threads, or both..